



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,669	05/31/2001	Lucas Gonze		7216

7590 11/19/2004
Greenberg and Lieberman Law Offices
314 Philadelphia Ave.
Takoma Park, MD 20912

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/867,669	GONZE, LUCAS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dustin Nguyen	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 19 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: spelling error, "originatorIn", on line 13, page 16.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Volftsun et al. [US Patent No 6,741,610], in view of Balassanian [US Patent No 6,629,163].

5. As per claim 1, Volftsun discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a computer network interpretation system, comprising:

at least one message object [i.e. signaling message] [col 4, lines 1-7],

Art Unit: 2154

at least two nodes relaying said at least one message object [Figure 2; col 4, lines 53-58; and col 14, lines 54-65], and

at least one protocol in said at least one message object [Abstract; col 14, lines 51-53; and col 17, lines 3-4].

Volftsun does not specifically disclose

a generic message object handler for interpreting said at least one message object.

Balassanian discloses

a generic message object handler for interpreting said at least one message object [Abstract; and col 7, lines 19-23].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Volftsun and Balassanian because Balassanian's teaching of object handler would desirable to have a technique for dynamically identifying a series of conversion routines for processing data [Balassanian, col 1, lines 65-66].

6. As per claim 2, Volftsun discloses wherein said at least one message object is protocol specific in nature [Abstract].

7. As per claim 3, Volftsun discloses wherein said at least one message object is inspecific in protocol [i.e. non-specific protocol] [Abstract].

8. As per claim 4, Volftsun discloses wherein said at least one message object is relayed from one of said at least two nodes [Figure 2; and col 4, lines 53-58].

9. As per claim 5, Volftsun does not specifically disclose wherein said one message object is intercepted by said generic message object handler. Balassanian discloses wherein said one message object is intercepted by said generic message object handler [col 2, lines 40-49]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Volftsun and Balassanian because Balassanian's teaching would allow to store the identification of a series of conversion routines so that the series can be quickly identified when data is received [Balassanian, col 2, lines 2-5].

10. As per claim 6, Balassanian discloses wherein said one message object may be reformatted to separate protocol than the inherent protocol, by said generic message object handler [col 4, lines 46-50].

11. As per claim 7, Balassanian discloses wherein said one message object is relayed by said generic message object handler to the non-initiating node of said at least two nodes [col 1, lines 19-24].

12. As per claim 8, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1-4.

13. As per claim 9, Volftsun discloses wherein said at least two nodes may be computers, cellular phones, personal organizational devices, pagers, or any household appliance with the ability to communicate with another machine [Figure 1].

14. As per claim 10, Volftsun discloses wherein said at least one message object may be relayed through many nodes before returning to its initiating node [col 15, lines 33-35; and col 27, lines 49-52].

15. Claims 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Volftsun et al. [US Patent No 6,741,610], in view of Balassanian [US Patent No 6,629,163], and further in view of Reisman [US Patent No 6,594,692].

16. As per claim 11, Volftsun and Balassanian do not specifically disclose wherein each of said many nodes applies a code to said at least one message object. Reisman discloses wherein each of said many nodes applies a code to said at least one message object [col 13, lines 65-col 14, lines 16; and col 15, lines 19-29]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Volftsun, Balassanian and Reisman because Reisman's teaching of code would allow to convert format in a quicker and more efficient manner.

17. As per claim 12, Reisman discloses wherein said code indicates which of said nodes the present node received said at least one message object from, and a signature code for said receiving node to indicate receipt [col 7, lines 58-64; and col 16, lines 60-65].

18. As per claim 13, Volftsun discloses wherein said at least one message may be passed through an indefinite number of said nodes [Figure 1; and Abstract].

19. As per claim 14, Volftsun discloses wherein when said at least one message is answered by one of said nodes and is reversed to return to the initiator node [col 23, lines 34-43].

20. As per claim 15, Volftsun does not specifically disclose wherein said code is read in a reverse format to return to said initiator node. Balassanian discloses wherein said code is read in a reverse format to return to said initiator node [col 1, lines 23-37]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Volftsun and Balassanian because Balassanian's teaching would allow to maintain data integrity.

21. As per claim 16, Volftsun and Balassanian do not specifically disclose wherein said code is systematically removed by each node that applied said code. Reisman discloses wherein said code is systematically removed by each node that applied said code [i.e. encapsulate, pack or unpack] [col 8, lines 24-26; col 13, lines 5-38; and col 25, lines 60-65]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Volftsun, Balassanian and Reisman because Reisman's teaching would allow standard transport operation, which is transparent to any high-level formatting of the transported information object, and standard in the sense that the transport operation can be essentially repeated for a wide variety of different information objects [Reisman, col 8, lines 18-23].

22. As per claim 17, Reisman discloses wherein each node removes only the part of said code that it applied [i.e. unpack] [col 7, lines 62-65].
23. As per claim 18, Reisman discloses wherein said code may be encrypted if necessary in any format [col 8, lines 32-38].
24. As per claim 19, Reisman discloses wherein said encryption is decrypted by the encrypting node when said message is returned to said initiator node [col 8, lines 26-31].
25. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-5321. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

Art Unit: 2154


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached at (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dustin Nguyen

Examiner

Art Unit 2154

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100